DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 469 HE 015 827

AUTHOR Bell, Margaret E.; And Others
TITLE Common Factors in Sex and Race Discrimination.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 12p.; This paper was identified by a joint project of the Institute on Desegregation at North Carolina Central University and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at The George Washington University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Assertiveness; *Black Students; *College Desegregation; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; Higher Education; Males; Minority Groups; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; *Sex Bias; Sex Differences; Sex Discrimination; Sex Role; *Student Attitudes; *White Students

ABSTRACT

Factors that might be common to sex and race discrimination were studied with a sample of 86 black and white graduate students enrolled in two Southern colleges. Attitudes toward changing economic roles for women and blacks were also assessed. Thirty-seven percent of the sample was under 30 years old, and 93 percent was from the Southeastern United States. A 34-item Likert-type scale covered: "changes in the status quo" (e.g., "women should not think themselves equal to men" and "black people are responsible for most of the crime in the country);" professions in which men or women are underrepresented and should seek more equalization; incentives for minorities; and female assertiveness. While none of the four subgroups (black male/female, white male/female) strongly disagreed with the educational system's encouragement of girls to be assertive, males, and particularly black males, reacted strongly to the factor "changes in the status quo," which had a large number of items dealing with the independence and/or supervisory ability of women. Black males exhibited the most discrimination on the sex items and more concern about incentives for minorities; white females expressed the greatest discrimination on the race items. It is concluded that race and sex discrimination are not necessarily separate entities, and that prejudicial attitudes toward blacks and women are indicative of perceived threat. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

COMMON FACTORS IN SEX AND RACE DISCRIMINATION

Margaret E. Bell, John P. Dolly, and Terry Helsley

University of South Carolina

ED225469

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret E. Bell
John Dolly
Terry Helsley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 015 827

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA 27707

INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION/INSTITUTE ON DESEGREGATION

COOPERATIVE PROJECT

This paper has been identified by a joint project of The Institute on Desegregation at North Carolina Central University and ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education at George Washington University. The purposes of this project are to identify, collect, and make available literature concerned with

(1) the problems of minority students in higher education in general and
(2) the problems of desegregation in historically black colleges and universities in particular.

New published and unpublished materials are reviewed and recommended by participants of the Institute on Desegratation's Interinstitutional Research Group (ID/IRG) for acquisition by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. An annual bibliography of this material will be published under the names of ERIC and the Institute.

Various types of materials are being solicited, especially unpublished and unindexed materials, as well as publications, produced by faculty and staff members. Included in these may be unpublished faculty studies, institutional research studies, master's theses, monographs, papers presented at professional meetings, articles from general and scholarly periodicals, and conference and workshop proceedings not covered by ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

To be acceptable for inclusion in the ERIC system, the materials submitted for evaluation must be (1) reproducible, (2) of sufficient substance to be of value to practitioners, researchers, scholars, and others, and (3) not repetitive of materials that are already currently available.

If additional information is needed about this cooperative project or the criteria for selection of materials, please write or call the Director of the Institute on Desegregation at 919/683-6433, North Carolina Central University, Durham, North Carolina 27707.

NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL UNIVERSITY IS A CONSTITUENT INSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Common Factors in Sex and Race Discrimination

Margaret E. Bell, John P. Dolly, and Terry Helsley
University of South Carolina

Legislative mandates as well as group efforts for reform are focusing attention on the economic rights of minorities, particularly blacks and women. This increased competition from minorities for society's benefits may result in increased prejudice by other groups in society. Prior research, however, has not investigated attitudes toward the changing economic roles of minorities. Rather studies have investigated either the variable of racial prejudice or that of sex bias with reference to specific situations. Typical examples include sex role stereotying (Bem, 1974), attitudes toward women managers (Peters, Torberg, and Trynor, 1974), the degree of sex attribution (Zeldow and Greenberg, 1976), cognitive differences between blacks and whites (Hurh, 1972), and the dimensions of verbalized racial attitudes (Brigham, Woodmansee, and Cook, 1976).

In contrast, the major purpose of the present study was to determine the responses of subgroups in the population toward four previously-identified factors common to sex and race discrimination. A secondary purpose was to determine the attitudes of the subgroups toward changing economic roles for women and blacks.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in this study were (a) there will be no significant difference between white males, white females, black males, and black females in their responses to two factors, "Support for the Status Quo," and "Professional Equality" previously identified as common to racial and sex discrimination, and (b) there will be no significant difference between white males, white females, black males and black females in their attitudes toward changing economic roles for women and blacks.

Method

Sample

Eighty-six graduate students enrolled in two southern institutions of higher learning formed the sample. Demographic data collected indicates that sixty-seven percent of the sample was younger than thirty years of age, with thirty-three percent over thirty. Age of the subjects ranged from 20 to 50. Females comprised sixty percent of the sample (N = 60) and males comprised thirty percent (N = 26). Sixty-one percent of the respondents (N = 53) were white and thirty-eight percent (N = 38) were black. With regard to the geographic area of longest residents, ninety-three percent (N = 80) of the sample were from the southeastern region of the United States.

Instrument

The instrument used in the study is a Likert scale with six alternatives per item: strong agreement, moderate agreement, slight disagreement, moderate disagreement, and strong disagreement. The

instrument is designed to measure attitudes toward women and blacks in contemporary American society. The total scale consists of thirty-four items; sixteen items measure sex discrimination, fourteen items measure racial discrimination, and two items deal with both race and sex. Each item is scored on a range from 0 to 5; an item score of 0 indicates no discrimination while a score of 5 indicates a high level of discrimination.

The instrument was developed from a pool of thirty-seven items that were categorized by three researchers as representing reactions to economic status changes for women or blacks. The items were then administered to an earlier sample of sixty-four graduate students in an institution of higher learning. A rotated factor analysis was used to identify items that measured attitudinal constructs related to role change. The three items that did not load on any of the four factors with a loading of at least .40 were eliminated. Cronbach's coefficient of reliability for the items on this administration of the scale was .74.

The factor analysis identified four factors for the instrument. Sixteen of the thirty-four items loaded on factor one, "Changes in the Status Quo." Examples of factor one items are, "women should not think themselves equal to men," and "black people are responsible for most of the crime in the country." Factor two included nine items which dealt with professions in which men and women are underrepresented and should seek more male/female equalization. Factor three "Incentives for minorities," included five items, and

factor four "Female assertiveness" included four items. Both sex and race discrimination items loaded on factors one, two, and three, while only sex discrimination items loaded on factor four.

Treatment

The scale was administered during regular class time by each instructor. Test directions for the subjects were included with the test.

Two-way analysis of variance was used to determine sex and race differences on the total scale, race discrimination items, sex discrimination items, and scale factors with a minimum of six items. A family-wise "t" comparison (Games, 1977) was used to analyze the differences in means for the groups of white males, white females, and black females.

Results and Discussion

Analysis of variance between the four groups for the total scale yielded an $F_{(3,80)}$ of 6.07, $p < .001$. The family-wise "t" comparisons yielded significant differences only between black males and white females and between black males vs. black females.

Significant differences between groups were also found for the race discrimination items and the sex discrimination items ($p < .001$). The obtained F-ratios for these analyses with degrees of freedom 3,82 were 13.242 and 11.538.

For the scale factors, significant differences were found for factor one, $F_{(3,82)} = 10.193$, $p < .001$ and factor two, $F_{(3,82)} = 6.171$. The family-wise "t" comparison indicated three

significant contrasts for the sex items as well as the factor one item. Two significant contrasts were found for factor two and the race discrimination items. (See Table One). The differences between white females and black males were significant for all of the ANOVAs, while nonsignificant differences were found for white males vs. black females for all ANOVAs.

Of the four groups (white males, white females, black males, and black females), black males exhibited the greatest degree of discrimination on the sex items, and the most disagreement with the items on factors one (see Table Two). White females expressed the greatest disagreement with the items on factor two and exhibited the greatest prejudice on the race items. Of the twelve significant contrasts, nine involved the black male subgroup, eight the white female subgroup, five concerned black females and only two the white male subgroup.

Due to the low number of items in factors three and four, analysis of variance was not performed on these items. The means of the four groups for factor four only varied from 5.29 for white females to 7.14 for black females. However the mean differences for the groups on factor three were considerably larger: black males = 10.64, white males = 7.07; black females = 6.77; and white females = 5.95. These data perhaps suggest no differences among groups in attitudes toward female assertiveness (factor four) and a greater concern of black males than other groups about incentives for minorities (factor three).

Conclusions

Administration of the prejudice and discrimination scale indicated that race and sex discrimination are not necessarily separate entities. The data in this study indicate that prejudicial attitudes toward blacks and women are indicative of the threat perceived by subgroups in the population. For example, none of the subgroups strongly disagreed with the educational system's encouragement of little girls to be assertive. However, males and particularly black males reacted strongly to factor one ("Changes in the Status Quo") which had a large number of items dealing with the independence and/or supervisory ability of women. In fact, since the only two significant contrasts for the total scale involved black males (when compared with black females and white females), there is some evidence that this group has the most discriminatory attitudes.

Efforts to combat attitudes hindering the advancement of blacks and women must be designed for the particular subgroup. More importantly, such efforts must deal with the personal and professional threat perceived as a result of advancement by the two groups.

Further research into race and sex discrimination should investigate the range of factors that contribute to prejudicial attitudes toward blacks and women. Specifically, further items should be developed on equalization of representation in professional and managerial settings as well as leadership roles.

References

Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Brigham, John C., Woodmansee, J. J., and Cook, S. W. Dimensions of Verbal Racial Attitudes: Interracial Marriage and Approaches to Racial Equality. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 9-21.

Games, Paul A. An improved "t" table for simultaneous control on "g" contrasts. Journal of the American Statistical Association. September, 1977, 531-534.

Hurh, Won Moo. Cognitive Differentials on Race Related Questions: A Case of Black and White College Teachers. Wisconsin Sociologist. 1972, 9, 67-79.

Peters, L. H., Torberg, J. R., and Trynor, J. Women as Managers Scale (WAMS): a measure of attitudes toward women in management positions. JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 27.

Zeldow, P. B. and Greenberg, R. P. The process of sex attribution: methodology and first findings. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 111-120.

Table 1
Contrasts for Means by Groups
for Prejudice and Discrimination Scale

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	SEX ITEMS	RACE ITEMS	TOTAL SCALE
CONTRAST 1 WM vs. WF	2.23	-0.83	3.45**	-2.10	1.44
CONTRAST 2 WM vs. BM	-2.71*	1.99	-2.39	1.89	-2.05
CONTRAST 3 WM vs. BF	2.01	2.20	2.26	2.28	1.94
CONTRAST 4 WF vs. BM	-5.13**	3.04*	-5.84**	4.06**	3.66**
CONTRAST 5 WF vs. BF	-.028	3.70**	-1.10	5.24**	.79
CONTRAST 6 BM vs. BF	7.732**	-0.14	4.62**	0.04	3.97**

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

(See Games, op. cit.)

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations
for Groups on Prejudice and Discrimination Scale

		Factor 1	Factor 2	Sex Items	Race Items	Total Scale
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS		(80)	(45)	(105)	(60)	(70)
WHITE MALES	MEAN	18.20	22.46	31.03	22.53	52.36
n = 15	S.D.	12.18	5.03	12.22	4.96	12.49
WHITE FEMALES	MEAN	10.92	23.92	19.42	25.71	46.08
n = 38	S.D.	10.88	6.08	11.46	4.88	14.92
BLACK MALES	MEAN	29.68	17.91	41.50	18.81	64.20
n = 11	S.D.	11.95	4.87	11.39	5.21	15.72
BLACK FEMALES	MEAN	11.00	18.20	22.68	18.75	43.11
n = 22	S.D.	8.42	6.07	9.16	4.96	12.00